Questioning the Link between Self-Expressed Attitudes and Repurchasing Behavior: Relations Between Cognitive, Affective and Action Loyalty

Guven ORDUN, PhDⁱ

Istanbul University School of Business, İstanbul, Turkey

Abstract

In psychology attitude is defined as favorable or unfavorable evaluations towards a person, group, object or event. Attitudes are formed by past and present experiences and are expected to change as a function of experience. Three components of the attitude defined as cognitive (what we know about the subject), affective (how we feel towards the subject) and behavioral (intention to behave towards the subject). Our behavior is defined as a complex combination of beliefs, feelings, capabilities and norms. The majority of consumer behavior literature examined the main antecedents of purchase behavior. Attitudes are described as one of the most important determinant of the behavior. There are several methods and techniques to assess attitude; the most used one is the self-report paper and pencil measures. Brand loyalty is another important concept related with repetitive purchasing behavior. While cognitive loyalty is related with the information, affective loyalty is related with feelings. Behavioral loyalty is described as the past behaviors or experiences. Some of our behaviors are determined by the cognitive component of the attitude while others may be directed by the affective part. Main focus of the research is to find out whether there is a level of compliance between cognitive, affective and behavioral attitude of consumers. 1000 forms are distributed in order to identify the attitudes and purchasing behaviors of consumers 783 forms are evaluated

JEL Classification: D01, D12, D23

Keywords: Consumer behavior, Attitude – Behavior Relationships, Commitment, Psychological Brand Loyalty, Repeat Purchasing Behavior

© 2015 Published by SSBFNET

ⁱCorresponding Author: Istanbul University School of Business

1. Introduction

Systematic approach to organization theory describes organizations as open systems and as a defect for all type of open systems; survival depends on their adaptation to the changing and threatening demands of the environment. Thriving, or even surviving, in this changing environment demands a thorough understanding of its dynamics, including how customers view their environment. Customers view suppliers and other aspects of their environment differently than suppliers do themselves. Taking this as an axiom, suppliers must be in tune with at least three key customer view factors: (1) the current needs of their customers, (what they value), (2) their satisfaction with the supplier's ability to meet those needs (to create that value for them), and (3) the forces that drive perceptions of value to change over time (Flint, Woodruff & Gardial, 1997).

There are three components of attitudes as cognitive, affective and behavioral (Fabrigar, MacDonald & Wegener, 2005). While cognitive component of attitudes refer to the beliefs and thoughts that we associate with the subject, affective component of the attitudes refer to the feelings and emotions linked to an object. Behavioral component of the attitudes are related with past behaviors and experiences regarding an attitude object. Some of our behaviors are directed by our cognitions (what we know and what we believe about the subject) and some of our behaviors are controlled by our emotions (like – dislike evaluations). In consumer behavior studies cognitive component is associated with brand involvement, affective commitment is associated with brand satisfaction and behavioral component is associated with repurchasing behaviors or brand loyalty.

Ajzen (1991) explains the relations between attitudes and behavior with the theory of planned behavior. Depending on the idea of planned behavior our behaviors are combined and complex function of our attitudes, self-sufficiency beliefs and perception of norms. If final behavior is directed by our willingness to perform, it becomes affective behavior. But if it is guided by the conformity to the expectations of group/society expectations it becomes normative behavior. Another important aspect of the equation is called as self-sufficiency of self-efficacy belief. Self-efficacy belief is mostly related with capability perceptions of one's self.

Reinforcement theory can be used for repetitive behaviors. Reinforcement theory explains repetitive behaviors by reward and punishment. If a behavior is rewarded than the likelihood of engaging a similar kind of behavior will be increased and will be decreased if a behavior is punished. This might be one of the main explanations for repetitive purchase behavior. When a consumer is satisfied with an action (feel rewarded by purchase) the likelihood of buying from a same brand will be increased. So that concept is explained as commitment (or loyalty) to a brand.

Commitment theory defined by Meyer and Allen (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993) is the most attributed one when dealing with different aspects of loyalty. Affective commitment requires satisfaction and involvement, a kind of deep engagement with a subject. Continuous commitment is the type of commitment when we have no or any better alternative. Normative commitment is mostly associated with ethical or moral values. In normative commitment although a better alternative exists you think that leaving the situation will not be appropriate. So sometimes it is “in the eye of the beholder”. We might think that human beings are rational; they make systematic

use of information and come up with the best possible solution as an action. But bounded rationality (Simon, 1972) proposes another decision-making pattern as we generally select the good enough (satisficing) possible solution.

There are internal and external contingencies that define and guide behaviors. When it is related with purchasing behavior we might want to know what consumers think (cognitive), how they feel (affective) and how they react (behavioral) in a given situation. And most important whether there is a significant relationship between how they think, feel and how they react?

2.Literatur Review

2.1 Consumer Involvement, Satisfaction and Repurchase Behavior

Involvement

Involvement represents the level of interest or importance of an object to an individual, or the centrality of an object to an individuals' ego structure. It simply can be defined as how much time and energy we allocate thinking of it due to the importance of the object/subject in our reference sets. The level of involvement determines the level of decision importance in the purchasing process, and business customers are likely to display attitudinal loyalty for high involvement purchases (Russell – Bennet, McColl-Kennedy & Coote, 2007).

Involvement is considered an individual difference variable. It is a causal or motivating variable with a number of consequences on the consumer's purchase and communication behavior. In marketing, price is probably the most commonly used indicator of involvement. Because the risks of a mispurchase are high when price is high, consumers are likely to be involved. Laurent and Kapferer (1985) propose 4 facets of involvement:

- (1) the importance of the product,*
- (2) perceived risk associated with the product purchase, which in turn has two subfacets:*
 - (a) perceived importance of negative consequences from a poor choice*
 - (b) the perceived probability of making such a mistake;*
- (3) the symbolic or "sign" value, and*
- (4) the hedonic value of the product.*

While antecedents of the involvement are described as personal needs, goals, characteristics, situational and decisional factors such as perceived risk of decision or imminence of decision, consequences of involvement are defined as search behavior, information processing and persuasion. (Andrews, Durvasula, & Akhter, 1990). Lockshin, Spawton and Macintosh (1997) used three different types of involvement measures as product, brand decisional and purchasing involvement to cluster the variables for retail segmentation in order to analyze customers' attitude to shopping, to the store and to sales people. So, simply search for the most appropriate alternative is not only related with our economical status but also related with the maximization of our satisfaction.

Customer Satisfaction

Satisfaction is described as the fulfillment of the needs and expectations. As we have different needs, values and expectations, similar outcomes will not satisfy us in a similar way or in an equal proportion. Customer satisfaction is investigated in terms of customer retention or relationship commitment (Bolton, 1998; Gustafsson, Johson, Roos 2005), purchase intentions (Anderson and Sullivan, 1993) or customer demographics (Mittal and Kamakura, 2001)

Low customer satisfaction implies greater turnover of the customer base, higher replacement costs. Due to the difficulty of attracting customers who are satisfied doing business with a rival, higher customer acquisition costs. Decreased price elasticity lead to increased profits for a firm providing superior customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction is affected by overall quality, price, and expectations. (Anderson, Fornell, Lehmann, 1994). Although customer satisfaction is analyzed as a strong determinant for customer retention, customer satisfaction may not always be resulted in customer retention or vice a versa dissatisfied customers may return to the same dealer. (Hennig-Thurau and Klee, 1997)

Another concept associated with satisfaction is called as customer delight. Customer delight is the reaction of customers when they receive a service or product that not only satisfies, but also provides unexpected value or unanticipated satisfaction. Chandler (1989) argues that customer satisfaction is related with largely a static process that focuses on today and deals with known circumstances and known variables. But customer delight is a dynamic, forward-looking process that takes place primarily in the unknown environment. This might be associated with continuous improvement, innovation and surprising the customer with a unique design.

Repurchase Behavior

The majority of literature related to repurchase behavior has examined the antecedents (i.e., satisfaction, service quality, loyalty) or causes of repurchase behavior. The reasoning behind this field of research is it is believed that understanding the determinants of repurchase behavior will allow management to alter their services, based on the best provision of the antecedents (i.e., improving the specific attributes of satisfaction most highly related to repurchase, to increase repurchase behavior). Yet, it is only an assumption of these studies that repeat visitors are good visitors. It is possible that repeat visitors spend less, are more price sensitive, or are a less desirable market than first time visitors. (Petrick, 2004)

In marketing and tourism analyses, repeat visits have generally been regarded as desirable because, among other things, it is thought, first, that the marketing costs needed to attract repeaters are lower than those required for first-time tourists; second, a return is a positive indicator of one's satisfaction; third, an inertial attitude of high repeaters increases their likelihood to return. (Oppermann, 1998). While first-timers are motivated by external factors (including the price of the holiday), repeaters favor factors inherent in the destination (such as the quality of the surroundings or accommodations), a consequence of their previous stay there (a reduction in nonmonetary costs) or a sense of emotional attachment. (Allegre and Juaneda, 2006)

An economic principle that assumes that individuals always make prudent and logical decisions that provide them with the greatest benefit or satisfaction and that are in their highest self-interest. This assumption is based on rational choice theory. But depending on the idea of bounded rationality (Simon, 1972; Simon, 1991) we only can choose the good enough option. When individuals make a decision, their rationality is limited by the information they have, the cognitive limitations of their minds and time constraints. Individuals by the lack of ability and resources to arrive at an optimal solution they can only seek for a satisfactory one. Sometimes we don't evaluate all the alternatives, as we don't have enough time, resource or information and purchase for immediate gratification of a need (impulsive buying behavior) from the closest store or search the store of a familiar brand (conative loyalty). So cognitive or affective loyalty will not always be resulted by repurchasing behavior (behavioral brand loyalty). Due to impulsive buying behavior, appealing offerings of other brands, or service failures, even conative loyalty will not be resulted by repurchasing behavior.

Consumer loyalty at cognitive stage is determined by information of the offering, such as price, quality, and so forth. It is the weakest type of loyalty because it is directed at costs and benefits of an offering and not at the brand itself. Cognitive loyalty is largely influenced by the consumer's evaluative response to experience, in particular to the perceived performance of an offering relative to price. Affective loyalty relates to a favorable attitude toward a specific brand or product. Conative loyalty implies that attitudinal loyalty must be accompanied by a desire to intend an action, for example, repurchase a particular brand. It is stronger than affective loyalty but has vulnerabilities as well. Repeated delivery failures are a particularly strong factor in diminishing conative loyalty. Consumers are more likely to try alternative offerings if they experience frequent service failures. (Evanschitzky & Wunderlich, 2006)

2.2. Attitudinal and Behavioral Brand Loyalty

Brand loyalty is defined as (1) the biased (i.e. non random), (2) behavioral response (i.e. purchase), (3) expressed over time, (4) by some decision-making unit (5) with respect to one or more alternative brands out of a set of such brands, and (6) is a function of psychological (decision making, evaluative) processes (Jacoby and Kyner, 1973). So brand loyalty has two perspectives as psychological (attitudinal) and behavioral. Repeat purchase behavior is an axiomatic term, which simply refers to the extent to which consumers repurchase the same brand after experiencing the brand. Since it is a purely behavioral construct, it is simply measured as the number of times a given brand is repurchased by a consumer in any given period of time. In contrast, the term brand loyalty is a complex concept that may require both psychological and behavioral measurements. (Jacoby and Chestnut, 1978). Behavioral loyalty requires either purchasing a single brand in a consistent manner or at least engaging four or more purchases from a single brand when multiple brands are offered. In psychological commitment consumer responds with the name of the brand when a question is administered like "which brand do you prefer?" The third option is called as the composite indices that consumer would only purchase from another brand in case of emergency.

Therefore, loyalty is a concept that goes beyond simple purchase repetition behavior since it is a variable that basically consists of one dimension related to behavior and another related to attitude. The mentality aspect is referred to as

attitudinal loyalty in some models, but because many other aspects than attitudes exists in the customer's mind, and because many other psychological variables than attitudes have been used as indicators of loyalty. (Söderlung, 2006)

Bloemer and Casper (1995) identified two distinct types of brand loyalty: true brand loyalty and spurious brand loyalty. A true brand loyal consumer is committed to his/her brand; because of this commitment, (s)he insists on buying the same brand the next time (s)he needs to buy the product again. A spurious brand loyal consumer is not committed to his/her brand; therefore, (s)he might buy the same brand the next time (s)he needs to buy the product again, but (s)he might also buy a different brand very easily. "The spurious loyal buyers lack any attachment to brand attributes, and they can be immediately captured by another brand that offers a better deal, a coupon, or enhanced point of purchase visibility through displays or other devices." For this consumer, the reason for buying the same brand again might be the comfort of not being forced to make a new choice, the time saved when buying the same brand again, the feeling of indifference with the choice, the familiarity with the brand, or the reduction of perceived risk

A detailed framework of loyalty presents loyalty as comprising four distinct, sequential phases. In the first loyalty phase, the brand attribute information available to the customer indicates that one brand is preferable to its alternatives. This stage is referred to as cognitive loyalty, or loyalty based on a brand belief only. At the second phase of loyalty development a liking or attitude toward a brand has developed on the basis of cumulatively satisfying occasions. This reflects the pleasure dimension and called as affective loyalty. The third one is labeled as conative (behavioral intention) loyalty and influenced by repeated episodes of positive affect the brand. Conation, by definition, implies a brand specific commitment to purchase. In the action loyalty sequence the motivation intention in the previous state is transformed into readiness to act. (Oliver, 1999)

3.Method and Analysis

Hypothesis

Although the main focus of the research is identification of the relations between cognitive, affective and behavioral components of buying behavior, the evaluation of differences depending on marital status variable is also formulated.

H1: Cognitive evaluations of the attributes are different depending on marital status

Attitudinal and behavioral loyalty express two related but distinct concepts in the consumer behavior literature. While attitudinal loyalty is formulated by cognitive and affective processes behavioral loyalty is generally associated with purchasing behavior. Investigation of the difference between how customers think and how they act is the main intention of the research.

H2: Self-expressed attitudes related with the importance of the attributes (cognitive component – level of involvement) do not reflect the purchasing behaviors of customers (behavioral – action loyalty)

Sampling

Attitudes are important predictors of behaviors. Although it is important to note that one may hold a favorable attitude toward a brand but not purchase it over multiple occasions because of comparable or greater attitudinal extremity toward other brands. Dick and Basu (1994) argue that for purposes of predictive validity, it is hence advantageous to compare brands that are viewed by consumers to be relevant in a consumption context. Depending on this idea, 7 brands are selected for the comparison. All the brands are working nationwide in Turkey and specialized selling female accessory, jewelry (silver rings, crystal ornaments, bracelets, necklaces, amulets, etc.) and watch. 1000 forms are distributed to current customers of these brands. But for the purposes of incomplete and inaccurate responses, the forms completed by males are excluded from the sample. 783 forms (completed by female consumers) are used for the research.

Table 1. Cross Frequencies for Variables Gender and Marital Status

	MARRIED	SINGLE	TOTAL
17 AND LESS	0	248	248
18 - 34	88	168	256
35 - 50	92	117	209
51 AND MORE	36	34	70
TOTAL	216	567	783

Questionnaire and Measures

The questionnaire has four main sections. First section is related with the demographics. Depending on the purpose and the scope of the research three demographics has been asked as gender, age and marital status. Second section of the questionnaire involves attributes explained below. These attributes are selected from different researches investigating the antecedents of purchasing behavior. Answers of the second section are labeled as (1) “least important” to (4) “most important”. Second section is intended to reveal out the cognitive evaluations (involvement levels within the attributes) of customers. On the third section of the questionnaire subjects are requested to associate each brand with each attribute whether it is good or bad. Third section clarifies the affective attitude (attitudinal loyalty) of the customers. On the last section of the questionnaire the subjects have been asked if they repetitively buy from each of the brands. Last section of the questionnaire is related with the behavioral loyalty or action loyalty of the customers. Main antecedents (attributes) of the research are selected as Price, Fashion, Prestige, Familiarity, Authenticity, Quality, Ambiance, Availability, Variety, Service and Design.

Price: The quantity of payment

Lichtenstein, Ridgway, & Netemeyer, (1993) proposes a model with both negative and positive role of a price on buying behavior. Negative roles of price are explained with value consciousness and price consciousness. Value Consciousness is conceptualized as reflecting a concern for price paid relative to quality received. Price consciousness refers to the degree to which the consumer focuses exclusively on paying low prices. Positive roles of price are explained with price – quality schema and prestige sensitivity. Price-quality schema is defined as perception of the

price in a positive manner because of an inference that the level of the price cue is related positively to the level of product quality. Prestige sensitivity is described as perceptions of the price cue due to inferences about what it signals to other people about the purchaser. For example, to the degree a consumer purchases an expensive wine not because of quality perceptions per se, but because of his/her perception that others will perceive the high price as reflective of internal traits of the purchaser

Fashion: *A popular style, being evaluated as trendy*

Sensory experiential products (e.g. apparel, accessories, jewelry) play a more important function in symbolic interaction with consumers' hedonic or emotional experiences in market environments. Given the importance of experiential aspects of consumption, it seems essential that marketers understand impulse buying behavior for fashion products from an experiential perspective. Fashion-oriented impulse buying refers to a person's awareness or perception of fashionability attributed to an innovative design or style. That is, fashion-oriented impulse buying occurs when consumers see a new fashion product and buy it because they are motivated by the suggestion to buy new products. Impulse buying was classified as four types: (1) planned impulse buying; (2) reminded impulse buying; (3) fashion-oriented impulse buying; and (4) pure impulse buying (Joo Park, Kim, Forney 2006)

Prestige: *A good reputation, widespread respect*

Consumers develop prestige meanings for brands based upon interactions with people (e.g., aspired and/or peer reference group), object properties (e.g., best quality), and hedonic values (e.g., sensory beauty). Prestige-seeking behavior is the results of multiple motivations, but in particular the motives of sociability and self-expression. Vigneron and Johnson (1999) defined five perceived values for prestige:

1. The consumption of prestige brands is viewed as a signal of status and wealth, and whose price, expensive by normal standards, enhances the value of such a signal (perceived conspicuous value).
2. If virtually everyone owns a particular brand it is by definition not prestigious (perceived unique value).
3. The role-playing aspects and the social value of prestige brands can be instrumental in the decision to buy (perceived social value).
4. For a brand, which satisfies, an emotional desire such as a prestige brand, a product's subjective intangible benefits such as aesthetic appeal is clearly determining the brand selection (perceived hedonic value).
5. Prestige is derived partly from the technical superiority and the extreme care that takes place during the production process. For instance, a Rolex Sea-dweller works 1,220 meters underwater and is hand-crafted (perceived quality value).

Familiarity: *Acquaintance with or knowledge of something*

Familiarity also related with brand awareness. Brand awareness is described as the extent to which potential customers recognize a brand. Laroche, Kim, Zhou (1996) specifies that consumer's confidence toward a brand may result from his/her familiarity or experience with the brand. And suggesting as an implication of the findings that, in order to increase a consumer's intention to buy a specific brand, a marketer needs to enhance his/her confidence in the brand. This may be realized by providing the consumer with more product related information, or direct experience.

Most of the times the cost of bringing a new brand to the market considerably high comparing with acquisition of a current brand due to brand awareness. In most of the mergers the purchase price reflected far more than the factories or the physical product produced therein. These corporate mergers were also about the acquisition of intangible assets—namely, brands. A product is "something that offers a functional benefit". A brand, on the other hand, is "a name, symbol, design, or mark that enhances the value of a product beyond its functional value". (Cobb-Walgren, Ruble, Donthu, 1995)

Authenticity: Being different or considerably unique

Uniqueness is defined as the trait of pursuing differentness relative to others through the acquisition, utilization, and disposition of consumer goods for the purpose of developing and enhancing one's self-image and social image. Consumer goods used for satisfying counterconformity motivations refer to product categories, brands, and versions or styles. Based on need-for-uniqueness theory, nonconformity research, and the consumer behavior literature, consumers' need for uniqueness is conceptualized as subsuming three behavioral manifestations or dimensions as creative choice counterconformity, unpopular choice counterconformity and avoidance of similarity (Tian, Bearden & Hunter, 2001)

Creative choice counterconformity reflects that the consumer seeks social differentness from most others but that this consumer makes selections that are likely to be considered good choices by these others.

Unpopular choice counterconformity refers to the selection or use of products and brands that deviate from group norms and thus risk social disapproval that consumers withstand in order to establish their differentness from others.

Avoiding similarity refers to devaluing and avoiding the purchase of products or brands that are perceived to be commonplace.

Quality: An excellence of standard

Quality can be defined broadly as superiority or excellence. By extension, perceived quality can be defined as the consumer's judgment about a product's overall excellence or superiority.' Perceived quality is (1) different from objective or actual quality. (2) a higher level abstraction rather than a specific attribute of a product. (3) a global assessment that in some cases resembles attitude, and (4) a judgment usually made within a consumer's evoked set. (Zeithaml, 1998)

Ambiance: atmosphere or character of a store

Most shoppers share the experience that, irrespective of the stock offered, some stores are more attractive than others, some stores induce a feeling of wellbeing, while in other stores one becomes irritated or even angry. And everybody also knows that one tends to buy more things and to spend more money when one is in a positive rather than in a negative mood state. Careful layout of an environment helps people to orientate, to find the way and learn to understand signs, to get the feeling of personal control and mastery. Successful layout of a store depends on whether the store has a clear concept, whether one can easily find things, whether different departments are clearly separated from each other, whether one does not get lost etc. Signs and information tables can help to improve the layout of a store. Studies investigating customers' behavior in a store showed that certain layout patterns were especially attractive for customers (Spies, Hesse & Loesch, 1997)

Availability: *The quantity and the accessibility of stores*

Customer impulsive behavior is described with immediate gratification of a need, generally a kind of behavior, which is not planned. Variety, accessibility and availability of the stores may increase the potential of impulsive buying behavior. Impulsive buying behavior is also affected by the intention of the customer. Major intentions are explained as: (Kollat & Willet, 1967)

1. Product and brand—Before entering the store the shopper knows both the product and brand of product to be purchased.
2. Product only—Before entering the store the shopper knows which product she wants, but has not decided on the brand, e.g., a plan to buy potato chips but not a particular brand.
3. Product class only—Before entering the store the shopper knows the class of product that she intends to purchase, but has not decided on the products in that class; e.g., intention to buy meat but must decide on steak or hamburger.
4. Need recognized—Before entering the store the shopper recognizes the existence of a problem or need, but has not decided which product class, product or brand that she intends to purchase, e.g., a need for something for dinner.
5. Need not recognized—Before entering the store the shopper does not recognize the existence of a need, or the need is latent until she is in the store and has been exposed to its stimuli

Variety: *The quantity and differentiated categories of the product*

If consumers have a clear preference for a particular alternative when purchasing an item for immediate consumption, that alternative is most likely to be chosen regardless of any general preference for variety. If, however, consumers are uncertain about their preferences, as they often are when making purchases for future consumption, the desire for variety is likely to have a more significant influence on the choices made. Consumers who simultaneously make purchases for several occasions would be more likely to select a variety of preferred items for three main reasons: (1) a desire for variety and change is more likely to influence purchase decisions when consumers are uncertain about their preferences, (2) given the possibility of a change in tastes, selection of variety reduces risk, and (3) in making multiple purchases, selection of the different top candidates for purchase can simplify the task and save the time and effort needed to determine most preferred alternative. (Simonson, 1990)

Service: *Adequacy, kindness and helpfulness of staff*

Five key dimensions of service quality have been identified (Bloemer, Ruyter & Wetzels, 1999). Reliability is defined as the ability to deliver the promised service dependably and accurately. It is about keeping promises (promises about delivery, pricing, complaint handling, etc.) Responsiveness can be described as the willingness to help customers and provide prompt service. This dimension stresses service personnel's attitude to be attentive to customer requests, questions and complaints. Assurance is the service quality dimension that focuses on the ability to inspire trust and confidence. Empathy is the service aspect that stresses the treatment of customers as individuals. Finally, tangibles are the service dimension that focuses on the elements that represent the service physically.

Design: Preferred image or ideal form of a product

The product constitutes one of the classic four P's of the marketing mix, and the most fundamental characteristic of a product is its exterior form or design. The form or design of a product may contribute to its success in several ways. First, in cluttered markets, product form is one way to gain consumer notice and with new product offerings, a distinctive design can render older competitors immediately obsolete and make later competitors appear to be shallow copies. Second, the form or exterior appearance of a product is important as a means of communicating information to consumers. The first Apple Macintosh possessed a compact, simple form to communicate ease of use and an almost anthropomorphic friendliness. Third, in addition to managerial considerations, product form is also significant in a larger sense because it affects the quality of our lives. The perception and usage of beautifully designed products may provide sensory pleasure and stimulation. In contrast, objects with unattractive forms may evoke distaste. Fourth, product form can also have long lasting effects. Although many goods are quickly discarded, the aesthetic characteristics of more durable products can have an impact for years on users and non-users alike as products become part of the sensory environment, for good or bad. (Bloch, 1995)

Results and Analysis

Independent sample t-test is applied in order to test whether mean scores are significantly different depending on their marital status.

Table 2. Mean Scores and Independent Sample Tests for Variable Marital Status

	Mstatus	N	Mean	Rank	t	Sig.
Price	Married	214	3.49	5	3.223	.001
	Single	563	3.34	5		
Fashion	Married	212	2.92	9	-.236	.813
	Single	564	2.93	9		
Prestige	Married	209	3.28	6	1.699	.090
	Single	563	3.16	7		
Familiarity	Married	203	2.91	10	2.033	.043
	Single	552	2.76	10		
Authenticity	Married	210	3.57	4	3.260	.001
	Single	567	3.38	4		
Quality	Married	206	2.41	11	-.117	.907
	Single	562	2.42	11		
Ambiance	Married	213	3.06	8	1.724	.085
	Single	567	2.94	8		
Availability	Married	215	3.26	7	.751	.453
	Single	567	3.21	6		
Variety	Married	214	3.63	3	1.496	.135
	Single	564	3.55	2		
Service	Married	214	3.72	2	3.761	.000
	Single	564	3.54	3		
Design	Married	216	3.89	1	.462	.644
	Single	563	3.88	1		

Subjects have been asked to evaluate the importance of each attribute, when making purchasing decisions about accessorize and jewelry. Design is assumed to be most important attribute that affects purchasing jewelry decisions. Service and product variety comes afterwards within the importance rank. Mean scores also represent the cognitive (involvement) attitudes of the subjects related with each attribute.

Design, service and product variety are evaluated as the most important aspects when it is all about purchasing accessorize or jewelry. Fashion, familiarity and quality attributes are also evaluated as important but those are the last ones on the importance ranking scale.

Design is evaluated much more important than quality. The product doesn't always need to be a sparkling diamond or 24K gold but it might be ok if it looks like one, if they want to make the purchase for daily purposes. Familiarity might be associated with psychological (attitudinal) brand loyalty. Also design, service and product variety is much more important than familiarity. We might come up with a conclusion that the psychological loyalty to a brand is limited when it is about buying jewelry. Maybe the segmentation of the brands is not so clear in the minds of consumers; maybe the all brands are somehow evaluated in a similar way.

First hypothesis was whether the cognitive evaluations of each attribute are significantly different depending on their marital status. The results of independent sample t-test statistics reveals out that first hypothesis can be accepted for several attributes but rejected for most of the attributes. With 0.95 confidence level the differences of the mean scores related with Price, Familiarity, Authenticity and Service is calculated to be significant. For each of the attributes married subjects have significantly higher scores when we compare it with the mean scores of singles.

Among all the highest mean difference is related with the expectations of service quality. Service quality may have different aspects but generally qualification, capability, product knowledge, enthusiasm, willingness to work, and helpfulness of staff is associated with service quality. Married subjects are expecting a higher level of service quality when compared with singles.

The hypothesis about the differences of cognitive evaluations depending on the marital status of the subject has been Price, Familiarity, Authenticity, and Service. Significant difference hypothesis is rejected for the variables Fashion, Prestige, Quality, Ambiance, Availability, Variety and Design.

On the second section of the questionnaire subjects are asked to evaluate which brand has the predefined attribute. In Table (3) cross frequencies (attributes and brands) are presented. Subjects evaluate each brand whether it is good related with a given attribute. Answers do not represents the opposite ends. So it doesn't mean it is blank it has to be bad.

Subjects have not been forced to choose either the alternative good or bad instead they are expected to select which brands are good with a given attribute. Maybe subjects do not have any past experiences (behavioral attitude) related with a brand so they can't properly evaluate the attribute whether it is good or bad.

Table 3. Cross Frequencies of Attribute Evaluations among Each Brand

		B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7
Price	Blank	376	568	711	628	661	623	679
	Good	407	215	72	155	122	160	104
Fashion	Blank	412	677	749	587	553	547	632
	Good	371	106	34	196	230	236	151
Prestige	Blank	649	698	748	629	419	521	516
	Good	134	85	35	154	364	262	267
Familiarity	Blank	596	724	764	602	409	501	541
	Good	187	59	19	181	374	282	242
Authenticity	Blank	560	722	771	609	436	538	552
	Good	223	61	12	174	347	245	231
Quality	Blank	602	720	749	591	425	499	529
	Good	181	63	34	192	358	284	254
Ambiance	Blank	488	703	766	625	496	513	565
	Good	295	80	17	158	287	270	218
Availability	Blank	263	625	730	635	660	628	653
	Good	520	158	53	148	123	155	130
Variety	Blank	306	638	720	601	595	610	652
	Good	477	145	63	182	188	173	131
Service	Blank	524	701	759	618	499	532	614
	Good	259	82	24	165	284	251	169
Design	Blank	446	693	764	570	439	504	565
	Good	337	90	19	213	344	279	218

On the third section of the questionnaire repurchase behaviors (either purchasing a single brand in a consistent manner or at least engaging four or more purchases from a single brand when multiple brands are offered) of the subjects have been asked.

Table 4. Repurchase Behavior of Customers from Specified Brands

	PURCHASE		TOTAL
	NO	YES	
BRAND1	103	680	783
BRAND2	332	451	783
BRAND3	641	142	783
BRAND4	404	379	783
BRAND5	462	321	783
BRAND6	394	389	783
BRAND7	567	216	783

Highest frequency for repurchase behavior is related with Brand1. Especially for the attributes price, availability and product variety this brand is ranked as the first one with the highest frequency in Table (3).

Table 5. Spearman Correlations Between Attributes and Past Purchases

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. PRICE	1.										
2. FASHION	.277	1.									
3. PRESTIGE	.157	.384	1.								
4. FAMILIARITY	.168	.403	.586	1.							
5. AUTHENTICITY	.178	.453	.517	.538	1.						
6. QUALITY	.185	.396	.586	.631	.562	1.					
7. AMBIANCE	.256	.453	.434	.526	.460	.488	1.				
8. AVAILABILITY	.456	.405	.207	.258	.301	.272	.400	1.			
9. VARIETY	.414	.433	.242	.276	.342	.337	.431	.576	1.		
10. SERVICE	.267	.449	.418	.496	.451	.508	.504	.366	.449	1.	
11. DESIGN	.301	.472	.505	.529	.534	.569	.567	.381	.438	.554	1.
12. PURCHASE	.379	.307	.141	.189	.194	.192	.276	.399	.380	.283	.313

All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed) in Table (5). For the purchase behavior among all attributes availability, product variety and price has the highest correlation coefficients. In order to test the impact of each attribute on repurchase behavior binary logistic statistic is applied.

Table 6. Significance of the Prediction

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	1541.479	11	.000
	Block	1541.479	11	.000
	Model	1541.479	11	.000

Table 7. Predictive Capacity of Model

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	6037.518 ^a	.245	.327

Depending on the test results we can say that the model is significant and Nagelkerke R Square value is 0.327.

Table 8. Goodness of Fit Statistics

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	93.637	5	.000

Table 9. Categories of Deviation between Observed and Expected Cases

Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

		PURCHASE = 0		PURCHASE = 1		Total
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
Step 1	1	246	281.281	116	80.719	362
	2	1749	1632.653	497	613.347	2246
	3	315	358.636	224	180.364	539
	4	222	269.481	297	249.519	519
	5	212	200.142	344	355.858	556
	6	89	107.028	460	441.972	549
	7	70	53.780	640	656.220	710

Goodness of fit statistics is computed to find out whether the differences between the observed and expected variables are significant. Although similarity hypothesis is expected within the test, scores reveals out that the differences are significant. Contingency table for Hosmer and Lemeshow test segregates predictive capabilities in segments and define observed and expected number of people in those categories, but the categorization is very sensitive to the sample size.

Table 10. Classification of Repurchases with Nonpurchases

Classification Table

	Observed		Predicted PURCHASE		Percentage Correct
			0	1	
Step 1	PURCHASE	0	2448	455	84.3
		1	1004	1574	61.1
	Overall Percentage				73.4

In Table (10) Repurchasers and Nonpurchasers are classified into groups. For the nonpurchasers 2448 predicted correct and 455 incorrect so model predicts nonpurchasers with an accuracy of 84%. For the repurchasers 1574 predicted correct and 1004 incorrect so model predicts repurchasers with an accuracy of 61%, the collective prediction capacity of model is 73.4 %.

The main focus of the study is to compare the cognitive, affective evaluations of the consumers and find out if there is a difference between what they think about an attribute and how they evaluate the attribute associated with a brand.

A binary logistic regression is applied to find out the relative impact of each attribute on repurchase behavior. The impact of familiarity, authenticity, quality and ambiance on repurchase behavior is not significant.

Table 11. Significance Tests and Coefficients of Variables

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
PRICE	1.263	.091	194.831	1	.000	3.537	2.962	4.224
FASHION	.564	.093	36.966	1	.000	1.757	1.465	2.107
PRESTIGE	-.355	.104	11.629	1	.001	.701	.572	.860
FAMILIARITY	.064	.109	.347	1	.556	1.066	.861	1.320
AUTHENTICITY	-.193	.104	3.466	1	.063	.825	.673	1.010
QUALITY	-.130	.110	1.395	1	.238	.878	.709	1.089
AMBIANCE	.182	.101	3.262	1	.071	1.200	.985	1.462
AVAILABILITY	.999	.099	102.835	1	.000	2.716	2.239	3.294
VARIETY	.669	.097	47.508	1	.000	1.952	1.614	2.361
SERVICE	.333	.102	10.596	1	.001	1.395	1.142	1.705
DESIGN	.613	.104	34.805	1	.000	1.846	1.506	2.264
Constant	-.979	.040	590.327	1	.000	.376		

Variable(S) Entered On Step 1: Price, Fashion, Prestige, Familiarity, Authenticity, Quality, Ambiance, Availability, Variety, Service, Design

Price seems to be the most important attribute on repurchasing behaviors. Second most important attribute is availability (quantity and accessibility of stores). Although all brands are offering a category with high-level precious products, most of the categories consist products for daily use. Price and availability are found to be most important attributes that directly affects repurchasing behaviors. Product variety and design are also considered to be important attributes. It is possible to interpret the findings that an important portion of the repurchase behaviors within these brands, products and categories involves impulsive buying.

Related with the cognitive evaluation design, service and variety are considered to be the most important attributes but price is evaluated as the fifth, availability as sixth and fashion as ninth. But in the regression test while evaluating the repurchase behaviors of the customers price and availability seems to be the most important attributes. Although fashion is evaluated as one of the least important attributes it has to be considered as important depending on the results of regression analysis.

4. Conclusion and Discussions

Companies invest in researches focusing to the needs and attitudes of consumers. Most probably the results of these researches are extremely important to plan for the future and implement a strategy. As specified before companies are willing to understand the current and changing needs of the customers in order to satisfy those needs in a convenient manner. But one should not forget that the behaviors of the consumers are affected by many different internal / external aspects and may be manipulated in different ways.

Sometimes we use heuristics to come up with a decision, as we don't have enough time, resource, and energy or maybe just we feel it that this is the most appropriate way of acting. When we act without thinking all the possible antecedents and consequences maybe the link will be weakened between how we think and how we act.

All the attributes are considered to be important by the current or potential customers. But sometimes engaging a kind of action (repurchasing behavior) is affected by shortcuts or just a few components. Maybe when it comes to react, another aspect that we consider not that important or hesitate to confess becomes the main source of the behavior.

Although majority of the studies praising repurchase behavior still there are some more questions to be answered. One of the most important question of all maybe the specification of the relations between repurchase behavior and profitability of the company.

Reichheld, Markey and Hopton say (2000) satisfaction surveys alone don't yield the information companies need to have about delivering value to customers. There is more and more evidence that people in the field are responding to corporate obsession with satisfaction by creating higher scores in ways that don't necessarily improve customer value. Reichheld & Teal (2001) proposed that consumer loyalty would not always be resulted as maximization of company profits and refuting:

the costs of serving loyal customers are less;

loyal customers are less price sensitive;

loyal customers spend more time with the company;

loyal customers pass on positive recommendations about their favorite brands or suppliers

Kumar and Shah also (2004) argues that attitudinal loyalty is much more important than behavioral loyalty, as the link between behavioral loyalty and profit of the organization is not so strong. Loyalty programs that reward customer behavior (such as purchase/visit frequency) without considering profitability run the risk of imminent failure. Take Airlines as an example. Most frequent flyer programs (until recently) rewarded customers on the basis of the distance traveled and not on the 'fare' paid by the customer. As a result, the customer who could get a cheap ticket at a fraction of the price from a web site would get the same value reward as a customer who would have paid the full-published fare. The result of this inconsistency could certainly be a factor in the financial results of the airlines with major airline companies such as United, Delta and American Airlines reporting losses.

So further researches should also investigate the relation between needs, attitudes, repurchase behaviors of the consumers with the profitability of the companies.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Alegre, J., & Juaneda, C. (2006). Destination loyalty: Consumers' economic behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(3), 684-706.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 49(3), 252-276.
- Anderson, E. W., & Sullivan, M. W. (1993). The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms. *Marketing science*, 12(2), 125-143.
- Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Lehmann, D. R. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: Findings from Sweden. *The Journal of Marketing*, 53-66.
- Andrews, J. C., Durvasula, S., & Akhter, S. H. (1990). A framework for conceptualizing and measuring the involvement construct in advertising research. *Journal of advertising*, 19(4), 27-40.
- Baker, J., Parasuraman, A., Grewal, D., & Voss, G. B. (2002). The influence of multiple store environment cues on perceived merchandise value and patronage intentions. *Journal of marketing*, 66(2), 120-141.
- Bloch, P. H. (1995). Seeking the ideal form: Product design and consumer response. *The Journal of Marketing*, 16-29.
- Bloemer, J. M., & Kasper, H. D. (1995). The complex relationship between consumer satisfaction and brand loyalty. *Journal of economic psychology*, 16(2), 311-329.
- Bloemer, J., De Ruyter, K. O., & Wetzels, M. (1999). Linking perceived service quality and service loyalty: a multi-dimensional perspective. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(11/12), 1082-1106.
- Bolton, R. N. (1998). A dynamic model of the duration of the customer's relationship with a continuous service provider: the role of satisfaction. *Marketing science*, 17(1), 45-65.
- Chandler, C. H. (1989). Beyond customer satisfaction. *Quality Progress*, 22(2), 30-32.
- Cobb-Walgren, C. J., Ruble, C. A., & Donthu, N. (1995). Brand equity, brand preference, and purchase intent. *Journal of advertising*, 24(3), 25-40.
- Dick, A. S., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 22(2), 99-113.
- Evanschitzky, H., & Wunderlich, M. (2006). An examination of moderator effects in the four-stage loyalty model. *Journal of Service Research*, 8(4), 330-345.
- Fabrigar, L. R., MacDonald, T. K., & Wegener, D. T. (2005). The structure of attitudes. *The handbook of attitudes*, 79 – 124.
- Flint, D. J., Woodruff, R. B., & Gardial, S. F. (1997). Customer value change in industrial marketing relationships: a call for new strategies and research. *Industrial marketing management*, 26(2), 163-175.

- Gustafsson, A., Johnson, M. D., & Roos, I. (2005). The effects of customer satisfaction, relationship commitment dimensions, and triggers on customer retention. *Journal of marketing*, 69(4), 210-218.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., & Klee, A. (1997). The impact of customer satisfaction and relationship quality on customer retention: A critical reassessment and model development. *Psychology & Marketing*, 14(8), 737-764.
- Jacoby, J., & Chestnut, R. W. (1978). Brand loyalty: Measurement and management.
- Jacoby, J., & Kyner, D. B. (1973). Brand loyalty vs. repeat purchasing behavior. *Journal of Marketing research*, 1-9.
- Joo Park, E., Young Kim, E., & Cardona Forney, J. (2006). A structural model of fashion-oriented impulse buying behavior. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 10(4), 433-446.
- Kollat, D. T., & Willett, R. P. (1967). Customer impulse purchasing behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21-31.
- Kumar, V. & Shah, D. (2004). Building and sustaining profitable customer loyalty for the 21st century. *Journal of retailing*, 80(4), 317-329.
- Laroche, M., Kim, C., & Zhou, L. (1996). Brand familiarity and confidence as determinants of purchase intention: An empirical test in a multiple brand context. *Journal of business Research*, 37(2), 115-120.
- Laurent, G., & Kapferer, J. N. (1985). Measuring consumer involvement profiles. *Journal of marketing research*, 41-53.
- Lichtenstein, D. R., Ridgway, N. M., & Netemeyer, R. G. (1993). Price perceptions and consumer shopping behavior: a field study. *Journal of marketing research*, 234-245.
- Lockshin, L. S., Spawton, A. L., & Macintosh, G. (1997). Using product, brand and purchasing involvement for retail segmentation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer services*, 4(3), 171-183.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(4), 538.
- Mittal, V., & Kamakura, W. A. (2001). Satisfaction, repurchase intent, and repurchase behavior: Investigating the moderating effect of customer characteristics. *Journal of marketing research*, 38(1), 131-142.
- Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty?. *The Journal of Marketing*, 33-44.
- Oppermann, M. (1998). Destination threshold potential and the law of repeat visitation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 131-137.
- Petrack, J. F. (2004). Are loyal visitors desired visitors?. *Tourism Management*, 25(4), 463-470.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 19, 123-205.
- Reichheld, F. F., & Teal, T. (2001). *The loyalty effect: The hidden force behind growth, profits, and lasting value*. Harvard Business Press.
- Reichheld, F. F., Markey Jr, R. G., & Hopton, C. (2000). The loyalty effect—the relationship between loyalty and profits. *European Business Journal*, 12(3), 134-139.

- Russell-Bennett, R., McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Coote, L. V. (2007). Involvement, satisfaction, and brand loyalty in a small business services setting. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(12), 1253-1260.
- Simon, H. A. (1972). Theories of bounded rationality. *Decision and organization*, 1(1), 161-176.
- Simon, H. A. (1991). Bounded rationality and organizational learning. *Organization science*, 2(1), 125-134.
- Simonson, I. (1990). The effect of purchase quantity and timing on variety-seeking behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 150-162.
- Söderlund, M. (2006). Measuring customer loyalty with multi-item scales: A case for caution. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 17(1), 76-98.
- Spies, K., Hesse, F., & Loesch, K. (1997). Store atmosphere, mood and purchasing behavior. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 14(1), 1-17.
- Tian, K. T., Bearden, W. O., & Hunter, G. L. (2001). Consumers' need for uniqueness: Scale development and validation. *Journal of consumer research*, 28(1), 50-66.
- Vigneron, F., & Johnson, L. W. (1999). A review and a conceptual framework of prestige-seeking consumer behavior. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *The Journal of marketing*, 2-22.